

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 30, 2003 (Paper No. 7). Claims 37 to 78 are currently in the application, of which Claims 37, 40, 43, 46, 48, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 61, 64, 67, 69, 71, 73, 75 and 77 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

All of the claims in the application, namely Claims 37 to 78 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 5,241,347 (Kodama). Applicants have considered the Examiner's comments together with the applied reference and respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

The present invention concerns an image forming apparatus that provides both copying functionality and printing functionality. According to one aspect of the invention, the printing functionality is provided by forming print image data from printing data transferred from an external device. Each of independent Claims 37, 40, 43, 46, 48, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 61, 64, 67, 69, 71, 73, 75 and 77 includes this functionality of the invention.

Kodama is understood to concern an image forming apparatus having automatic image density adjustment. See Abstract of Kodama. However, the image forming apparatus described in Kodama is understood merely to provide copying functionality. Nowhere in Kodama is the described image forming apparatus understood to provide the printing functionality of the present invention.

The Office Action contended that printer controller 201 corresponded with the printer controller of the present invention, which forms print image data from printing

data received from an external device. As shown in Figure 2c of Kodama, however, printer controller 201 is not understood to receive printing data for forming print image data from an external device. Therefore, Kodama is not understood to disclose providing printing functionality by forming print image data from printing data transferred from an external device.

Since each and every feature of the present invention is not described in Kodama, Kodama is not understood to anticipate the present invention. See MPEP § 2131. Accordingly, independent Claims 37, 40, 43, 46, 48, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 61, 64, 67, 69, 71, 73, 75 and 77 are believed to be allowable over Kodama. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(c) rejection of the independent claims are respectfully requested.

The other claims in the application are dependent from the independent claims discussed above and therefore are believed to be allowable over the applied reference for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California, office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 50,957

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 73560 v 1